

# ISOMORPHISMS OF LATTICES OF BURES-CLOSED BIMODULES OVER CARTAN MASAS

ADAM H. FULLER AND DAVID R. PITTS

**ABSTRACT.** For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $(\mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  be pairs consisting of a Cartan MASA  $\mathcal{D}_i$  in a von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{M}_i$ , let  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D}_i)$  be the set of atoms of  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , and let  $\mathfrak{S}_i$  be the lattice of Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}_i$  bimodules in  $\mathcal{M}_i$ . We show that when  $\mathcal{M}_i$  have separable preduals, there is a lattice isomorphism between  $\mathfrak{S}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_2$  if and only if the sets  $\{(Q_1, Q_2) \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D}_1) \times \text{atom}(\mathcal{D}_2) : Q_1 \mathcal{M}_1 Q_2 \neq (0)\}$  have the same cardinality. In particular, when  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is non-atomic,  $\mathfrak{S}_i$  is isomorphic to the lattice of projections in  $L^\infty([0, 1], m)$  where  $m$  is Lebesgue measure, regardless of the isomorphism classes of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra containing a Cartan MASA  $\mathcal{D}$ ; we call  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  a Cartan pair. Feldman and Moore [5, 6] gave a construction of Cartan pairs with separable preduals based on Borel measurable equivalence relations and showed that all (separably acting) Cartan pairs arise from their construction. Building on the work of Feldman and Moore [5, 6], and Arveson [2], Muhly, Solel and Saito [10] introduced the Spectral Theorem for Bimodules. They claimed that if  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -weakly closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule of  $\mathcal{M}$ , then there is a Borel subset  $\mathcal{B}$  of the Feldman-Moore relation  $R$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  consists of all those operators in  $\mathcal{M}$  whose “matrices” are supported in  $\mathcal{B}$ . That is, the  $\sigma$ -weakly closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule  $\mathcal{S}$  is determined precisely by its support  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Unfortunately, there is a gap in the proof of the Spectral Theorem for Bimodules; consult the “added in proof” portion of Aoi’s paper [1] for details. While we are not aware of any complete proof of the Spectral Theorem for Bimodules, Fulman [7] has established it when  $\mathcal{M}$  is hyperfinite and  $\mathcal{M}_*$  is separable.

In a recent paper, Cameron, the second author and Zarikyan [4], introduced a new perspective to the study of  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodules in a Cartan pair  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . The approach in [4] is operator theoretic and avoids the measure theoretic tools of Feldman and Moore. In [4], a version of the Spectral Theorem for Bimodules is proved, not for  $\sigma$ -weakly closed bimodules but for *Bures*-closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodules. In fact, it is shown that the Spectral Theorem for Bimodules as introduced in [10] is true if and only if every  $\sigma$ -weakly closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule is itself Bures-closed.

In this paper, we continue the study of the Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodules in a Cartan pair  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . Our main result, Theorem 4.3, shows that the lattice of Bures-closed bimodules for a separably acting Cartan pair  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  depends upon: i) whether  $\mathcal{D}$  contains a diffuse part, and ii) the cardinality of the restriction of the Murray-von Neumann equivalence relation for projections of  $\mathcal{M}$  to the atoms of  $\mathcal{D}$ . In this sense,

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46L10, Secondary 46L51.

*Key words and phrases.* Bimodule, Cartan MASA.

the lattice of Bures-closed bimodules depends suprisingly little on the Cartan pair  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ , when  $\mathcal{M}$  is separably acting. In particular, if  $(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$  are any two Cartan pairs in which  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  are separably acting diffuse algebras, then they share the same lattice structure of Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodules.

Along the way, in Section 3, we give a fuller description of the supports of partial isometry normalizers of  $\mathcal{D}$ . In particular, we describe a pre-order on  $\mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ , the set consisting of all partial isometry normalizers of  $\mathcal{D}$ , which is induced by their supports.

## 2. BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARIES

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra. A MASA (maximal abelian self-adjoint subalgebra)  $\mathcal{D}$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  is *Cartan* if

- (a) there is a faithful, normal conditional expectation  $E : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ , and
- (b)  $\text{span}\{U \in \mathcal{M} : U \text{ is unitary and } U\mathcal{D}U^* = \mathcal{D}\}$  is  $\sigma$ -weakly dense in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

If  $\mathcal{D}$  is Cartan in  $\mathcal{M}$  we call  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  a *Cartan pair*. The set of *normalizers* for  $\mathcal{D}$  is the set

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) = \{v \in \mathcal{M} : v^*\mathcal{D}v \cup v\mathcal{D}v^* \subseteq \mathcal{D}\}.$$

The *groupoid normalizers*, denoted  $\mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ , are the elements of  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  which are partial isometries. Clearly,  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  and  $\mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  are  $\sigma$ -weakly dense in  $\mathcal{M}$  when  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  is a Cartan pair.

**Notation 2.1.** For any abelian von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{W}$ ,  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{W})$  will denote the set of atoms in  $\mathcal{W}$ . Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a Cartan pair, and let  $R_a$  be the restriction of the Murray-von Neumann equivalence relation on projections of  $\mathcal{M}$  to  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ . For  $A_1, A_2 \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  write  $A_1 \sim A_2$  when  $(A_1, A_2) \in R_a$ .

Notice that if  $v \in \mathcal{M}$  is a partial isometry such that  $v^*v, vv^* \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ , then  $v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . Indeed, for  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $dv^*v \in \mathbb{C}v^*v$ , so  $vdv^* = vdv^*vv^* \in \mathbb{C}vv^* \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . Likewise,  $v^*dv \in \mathcal{D}$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a Cartan pair, and set  $X := \sum_{Q \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})} Q$ . Then  $X$  is a central projection of  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $U \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a unitary normalizer. For each  $Q \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ ,  $UQU^* \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ , and the map  $Q \mapsto UQU^*$  is a permutation of  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ . Hence  $UXU^* = X$ , and hence  $X$  commutes with  $U$ . As  $\mathcal{M}$  is generated by its unitary normalizers,  $X$  is in the center of  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $\square$

Thus, any Cartan pair decomposes as a direct sum of two Cartan pairs,  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) = (\mathcal{M}_c, \mathcal{D}_c) \oplus (\mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{D}_a)$ , where  $(\mathcal{M}_c, \mathcal{D}_c) = (\mathcal{M}X^\perp, \mathcal{D}X^\perp)$  and  $(\mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{D}_a) = (\mathcal{M}X, \mathcal{D}X)$ . Clearly,  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D}_c) = \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{D}_a$  is generated by its atoms. We shall call  $(\mathcal{M}_c, \mathcal{D}_c)$  and  $(\mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{D}_a)$  the *continuous* and *atomic* parts of  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  respectively.

Henceforth, let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a Cartan pair with conditional expectation  $E$ . Fix a faithful normal semi-finite weight  $\phi$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\phi \circ E = \phi$ . We shall freely use notation from [12] (see pages 41-42 for discussion of  $\mathfrak{n}_\phi := \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \phi(x^*x) < \infty\}$ , Definition VII.1.5 for a discussion of the semi-cyclic representation  $(\pi_\phi, \mathfrak{H}_\phi, \eta_\phi)$ , etc.). The following follows from the fact that  $\phi \circ E = \phi$ ; details of the proof are left for the reader.

**Lemma 2.3.** *With this notation,  $\mathfrak{n}_\phi$  and  $\mathfrak{n}_\phi^*$  are  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodules, and for  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $x \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi$ , and  $y \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi^*$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\phi((dx)^*(dx)), \phi((xd)^*(xd))\} &\leq \|d\|^2 \phi(x^*x) \quad \text{and} \\ \max\{\phi((dy^*)^*(dy^*)), \phi((y^*d)^*(y^*d))\} &\leq \|d\|^2 \phi(yy^*). \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.4.** Modifying [12, Definition IX.1.13] very slightly, we will say that a quadruple  $\{\pi, \mathfrak{H}, J, \mathfrak{P}\}$  is a *standard form* for  $\mathcal{M}$  if  $\pi$  is a faithful normal representation of  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $\mathfrak{H}_\pi$  and  $\{\pi(\mathcal{M}), \mathfrak{H}, J, \mathfrak{P}\}$  is a standard form for  $\pi(\mathcal{M})$  as in [12, Definition IX.1.13]. Due to the uniqueness of the standard form (see [12, Theorem IX.1.14]), we may, and sometimes will, assume without loss of generality that  $\{\pi(\mathcal{M}), \mathfrak{H}, J, \mathfrak{P}\} = \{\pi_\phi(\mathcal{M}), \mathfrak{H}_\phi, J_\phi, \mathfrak{P}_\phi\}$ , where  $\phi$  is a faithful, semi-finite, normal weight on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\phi \circ E = \phi$ .

When  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  is a Cartan pair and  $\{\pi, \mathfrak{H}, J, \mathfrak{P}\}$  is a standard form for  $\mathcal{M}$ , define representations  $\pi_\ell$  and  $\pi_r$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\mathfrak{H}_\pi$  by

$$\pi_\ell(d) = \pi(d) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_r(d) = J\pi(d^*)J, \quad (1)$$

and set

$$\mathcal{Z} = (\pi_\ell(\mathcal{D}) \cup \pi_r(\mathcal{D}))''. \quad (2)$$

The purpose of the following is to observe that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is uniquely determined. The proof is an immediate consequence of [4, Theorem 1.4.7] and [12, Theorem IX.1.14].

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a Cartan pair. For  $i = 1, 2$ , suppose  $\{\pi_i, \mathfrak{H}_i, J_i, \mathfrak{P}_i\}$  are standard forms for  $\mathcal{M}$ , and let  $\pi_{r,i}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_i$  be as in (1) and (2). Then there exists a unique unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_1, \mathfrak{H}_2)$  such that*

- (a)  $\pi_2(x) = U\pi_1(x)U^*$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ;
- (b)  $J_2 = UJ_1U^*$ ;
- (c)  $\mathfrak{P}_2 = U\mathfrak{P}_1$ ;
- (d)  $\pi_{r,2}(d) = U\pi_{r,1}(d)U^*$ ,  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ ;
- (e)  $\mathcal{Z}_i$  is a MASA in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_i)$ ; and
- (f)  $\mathcal{Z}_1 \ni z \mapsto UzU^*$  is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  onto  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ .

**2.1. Bimodules.** The *Bures topology*, see [3], on  $\mathcal{M}$  is the locally convex topology generated by the family of seminorms

$$\{T \mapsto \sqrt{\tau(E(T^*T))} : \tau \in (\mathcal{D}_*)^+\}.$$

In this note we are primarily interested in the Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodules in  $\mathcal{M}$ . When the Cartan MASA is understood, we will sometimes simply say “bimodule” in place of “ $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule.” Any Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule is necessarily  $\sigma$ -weakly closed.

It is shown in [4, Theorem 2.5.1] that if  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  is a non-zero Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule, then  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  generates  $\mathcal{S}$  as a Bures-closed bimodule. We will make frequent use of this fact.

Given a  $\sigma$ -weakly closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , the *support of  $\mathcal{S}$* , denoted  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{S})$ , is the orthogonal projection onto the  $\mathcal{Z}$ -invariant subspace,  $\pi_\phi(\mathcal{S})\eta_\phi(\mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D})$ ; as  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a MASA in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ ,  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{S})$  is a projection in  $\mathcal{Z}$ . For an operator  $T \in \mathcal{M}$ , define  $\text{supp}(T)$  to be the support of the Bures-closed bimodule generated by  $T$ . The definition of the support of a bimodule given here is as introduced in [4]. The original concept was introduced in [10].

For a partial isometry  $w \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  we denote  $\text{supp}(w)$  by  $P_w$ . Picking and choosing results from [4] we have the following alternative descriptions of  $P_w$ .

**Lemma 2.6** ([4, Lemma 1.4.6 and Lemma 2.1.3]). *Given any  $w \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  the following hold.*

- (a) *Let  $\Lambda$  be an invariant mean on the (discrete) group of unitaries in  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D})$  (which we may assume to satisfy  $\Lambda_{U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D})} f(U) = \Lambda_{U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D})} f(U^*)$  for every  $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D}))$ ). Then*

$$P_w = \bigwedge_{U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D})} \pi_\ell(wUw^*)\pi_r(U^*).$$

- (b)  *$P_w$  is the orthogonal projection onto  $\overline{\{\eta_\phi(wd) : d \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}\}}$ , and for  $x \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi$ ,*

$$P_w \eta_\phi(x) = \eta_\phi(wE(w^*x)).$$

We may view  $\mathcal{S} \mapsto \text{supp}(\mathcal{S})$  as a map from the set of  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodules of  $\mathcal{M}$  into the projection lattice of  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Conversely, given a projection  $Q$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , define a  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule,  $\text{bimod}(Q)$ , by

$$\text{bimod}(Q) = \{T \in \mathcal{M} : \text{supp}(T) \leq Q\}.$$

It follows from [4, Lemma 2.1.4(c)] that  $\text{bimod}(Q)$  is Bures-closed. The operations  $\text{bimod}$  and  $\text{supp}$  satisfy the following “reflexivity-type” condition.

**Theorem 2.7** ([4, Theorem 2.5.1]). *A  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  is Bures-closed if and only if*

$$\mathcal{S} = \text{bimod}(\text{supp}(\mathcal{S})).$$

### 3. PROJECTIONS AND RELATIONS

Throughout this section, let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a Cartan pair with conditional expectation  $E$ . Let  $\{\pi, \mathfrak{H}, J, \mathfrak{P}\}$  be a standard form of  $\mathcal{M}$ , and construct the maximal abelian algebra  $\mathcal{Z}$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$  as discussed in section 2. We do not impose any condition of separable predual in this section.

Our aim in this section is to better describe how the projections in  $\mathcal{D}$  relate to each other, in terms of the normalizers in  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . This in turn will provide us with a better description of some of the projections in  $\mathcal{Z}$ . In Proposition 3.3, we will describe exactly when  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) = 0$  for projections  $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ . This will be determined by the existence of certain normalizers in  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . In the case of atomic projections in  $\mathcal{Z}$  we will be able to go further. In Proposition 3.7 we will show that the atomic projections of  $\mathcal{Z}$  are completely determined by the atomic projections in  $\mathcal{D}$ . This is a key tool in proving our main result.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $Q_1, Q_2$  be projections in  $\mathcal{D}$ . If  $w \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  then  $ww^* \leq Q_1$  and  $w^*w \leq Q_2$  if and only if  $w \in \text{bimod}(\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2))$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $ww^* \leq Q_1$  and  $w^*w \leq Q_2$ . By [4, Lemma 2.1.4] it suffices to show that  $\pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(\mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}) \subseteq \text{range}(\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2))$ . Take any  $d \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)\pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(d) &= \eta_\phi(Q_1wdQ_2) \\ &= \eta_\phi(Q_1wQ_2d) \\ &= \eta_\phi(wd) \\ &= \pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(d). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(\mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}) \subseteq \text{range}(\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2))$  and  $w \in \text{bimod}(\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2))$ .

Conversely, suppose  $w \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) \cap \text{bimod}(\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2))$ . Let  $v = w - Q_1 w Q_2$ . We will be done once we show that  $v = 0$ . Note that, again by [4, Lemma 2.1.4],  $\pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(d) \in \text{range}(\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2))$ . Thus for  $d \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\phi(v)\eta_\phi(d) &= \pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(d) - \pi_\phi(Q_1 w Q_2)\eta_\phi(d) \\ &= \pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(d) - \eta_\phi(Q_1 w d Q_2) \\ &= \pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(d) - \pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)\pi_\phi(w)\eta_\phi(d) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\eta_\phi(vd) = 0$  for all  $d \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}$ . By the faithfulness of  $\phi$  it follows that  $vd = 0$  for all  $d \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{n}_\phi \cap \mathcal{D}$  is weak-\* dense in  $\mathcal{D}$ , it follows that  $vd = 0$  for every  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ . Hence  $v = 0$ .  $\square$

We will give a more complete description of the relationship between the projections  $\{P_v : v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})\}$  and the partial isometries in  $\mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  in Lemma 3.6. For the time being, Lemma 3.1 gives the following statement.

**Corollary 3.2.** *If  $u, v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  and  $P_u = P_v$ , then  $vv^* = uu^*$  and  $v^*v = u^*u$ .*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Lemma 3.1: if  $P_u \leq P_v$ , then, since  $P_v \leq \pi_\ell(vv^*)\pi_r(v^*v)$ ,  $uu^* \leq vv^*$  and  $u^*u \leq v^*v$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** *For any two projections  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \neq 0$ ;
- (b) *there is a non-zero  $v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  such that  $vv^* \leq Q_1$  and  $v^*v \leq Q_2$ ;*
- (c)  $Q_1\mathcal{M}Q_2 \neq \{0\}$ ;
- (d) *there exists a  $\sigma$ -weakly closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  such that  $Q_1\mathcal{S}Q_2 \neq \{0\}$ .*

*Proof.* The equivalence of (a) and (b) follows immediately from Lemma 3.1, since  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \neq 0$  implies that  $\text{bimod}(\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)) \neq \{0\}$ .

Suppose (b) holds. Given  $v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  such that  $vv^* \leq Q_1$  and  $v^*v \leq Q_2$ , we have  $Q_1 v Q_2 = v$  and so  $Q_1\mathcal{M}Q_2 \neq \{0\}$ . This gives (c).

That (c) implies (d) is obvious. Finally suppose (d) holds. Clearly,  $Q_1\mathcal{S}Q_2$  is a  $\sigma$ -weakly closed  $\mathcal{D}$ -bimodule. By [4, Proposition 1.3.4], there exists  $0 \neq v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) \cap Q_1\mathcal{S}Q_2$ . Then  $v = Q_1 v Q_2$ ,  $vv^* \leq Q_1$  and  $v^*v \leq Q_2$ . Hence (b) holds, and we are done.  $\square$

The support projections  $\{P_w \in \mathcal{Z} : w \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})\}$  have a natural partial ordering on them, induced from the partial ordering of the projections in  $\mathcal{Z}$ . This ordering imposes a pre-order on  $\mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ , which we now describe.

**Definition 3.4.** For  $u, v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  we write  $u \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$  if there is a  $d$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  such that  $u = vd$ .

It is not hard to see that  $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$  is a pre-order on  $\mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . For any scalar  $\lambda$  with  $|\lambda| = 1$  and  $v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  we have  $v \leq_{\mathcal{D}} \lambda v$  and  $\lambda v \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$  so  $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$  is indeed a pre-order and not a partial order. Recall that partial isometries come already equipped with a partial ordering  $\leq$  (see, for example, [8]). In this order  $u \leq v$  if and only if there is a projection  $P$  such that  $u = vP$ . In fact,  $P$  can be chosen to be  $u^*u$ . It follows that if  $u, v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  and  $u \leq v$  then  $u \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$ . Hence the ordering  $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$  is coarser than the usual ordering  $\leq$  on partial isometries.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $u, v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . If  $u \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$ , then  $v^*u \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $u = v(v^*u)$ .*

*Proof.* As  $u \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$  there is a  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $u = vd$ . Then  $v^*u = v^*vd$  is in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let

$$a = vd - vv^*u.$$

We will show  $a = 0$ . We have,

$$\begin{aligned} a^*a &= (vd - vv^*u)^*(vd - vv^*u) \\ &= d^*v^*vd - d^*v^*u - u^*vd + u^*vv^*u \\ &= d^*v^*vd - d^*v^*vd - d^*v^*vd + d^*v^*vv^*vd \quad (\text{since } u = vd) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Now we relate the pre-ordering to supports of elements of  $\mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $u, v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $u \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$ ;
- (b)  $u = vE(v^*u)$ ; and
- (c)  $P_u \leq P_v$ .

*Proof.* The previous lemma shows that (a) implies (b).

Suppose next that  $u = vE(v^*u)$ . For any  $x \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi$  we see that

$$\begin{aligned} P_v P_u \eta_\phi(x) &= P_v \eta_\phi(uE(u^*x)) \\ &= \eta_\phi(vE(v^*u)E(u^*x)) \\ &= \eta_\phi(uE(u^*x)) = P_u \eta_\phi(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $P_u \leq P_v$ . So (b) implies (c).

Now assume that  $P_u \leq P_v$  for some  $u, v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . We aim to show that  $u = vE(v^*u)$ . As  $P_u \leq P_v$  a similar calculation to above shows that, for all  $x \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi$

$$\eta_\phi(vE(v^*u)E(u^*x)) = \eta_\phi(uE(u^*x)).$$

As  $\phi$  is faithful, it follows that for all  $x \in \mathfrak{n}_\phi$  we have

$$vE(v^*u)E(u^*x) = uE(u^*x).$$

As  $\mathfrak{n}_\phi$  is weak-\* dense in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $E$  is normal, the above equation holds for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . In particular it holds when  $x = u$ , and hence  $u = vE(v^*u) \in v\mathcal{D}$ . Therefore  $u \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$ .  $\square$

We now classify the atomic projections of  $\mathcal{Z}$  in terms of the atomic projections in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a Cartan pair with standard form  $\{\pi, \mathfrak{H}, J, \mathfrak{P}\}$ . The following statements hold.*

- (a) *If  $A \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ , then there exist unique  $Q_1, Q_2 \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  such that  $A = \pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)$ . In addition,  $Q_1 \sim Q_2$ .*
- (b) *For  $i = 1, 2$ , suppose  $Q_i \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  and  $Q_1 \sim Q_2$ . Then  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ .*
- (c) *The algebras  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfy,*

$$\sum_{Q \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})} Q < I_{\mathcal{D}} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sum_{A \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})} A < I_{\mathcal{Z}}.$$

*Proof. Part a)* Take any non-zero  $A \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ . As  $A \neq 0$  there is a non-zero  $v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) \cap \text{bimod}(A)$ . Hence  $P_v$  is a non-zero projection satisfying  $P_v \leq A$ . As  $A$  is atomic it follows that  $P_v = A$ . Let  $Q_1 = vv^*$  and  $Q_2 = v^*v$ . Obviously,  $Q_1 \sim Q_2$ . We aim to show that  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are atoms of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Suppose that  $P \leq Q_1$  is a non-zero projection in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $u = Pv$ . Then  $uu^* = P$  and  $u^*u \leq Q_2$ . We also have that  $u \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  and  $u \leq v$ . Hence  $u \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$ . By Lemma 3.6, we have that  $P_u \leq P_v$ . As  $u$  is non-zero and  $P_v$  is atomic it follows that  $P_u = P_v$ . By Corollary 3.2,  $P = Q_1$ , and thus  $Q_1 \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ . A similar argument shows  $Q_2 \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ .

Recall that a projection  $B$  in an abelian von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{W}$  belongs to  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{W})$  if and only if  $\mathcal{W}B$  is one-dimensional. Thus, for any  $h, k \in \mathcal{D}$ , we have

$$\pi_\ell(h)\pi_r(k)\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \in \mathbb{C}\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2).$$

Since  $\mathcal{Z} = \overline{\text{span}}^{\text{weak-*}}\{\pi_\ell(h)\pi_r(k) : h, k \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , it follows that  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)\mathcal{Z}$  is one-dimensional and hence  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ . As  $A = P_v \leq \pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)$ , it follows that  $A = \pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)$ . Uniqueness of  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  follows from Corollary 3.2.

*Part b)* Suppose that for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $Q_i \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  and  $Q_1 \sim Q_2$ . Let  $v \in \mathcal{M}$  be a partial isometry so that  $vv^* = Q_1$  and  $v^*v = Q_2$ . As observed earlier,  $v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . Hence,  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \neq 0$  by Proposition 3.3. An argument similar to that used in part (a) shows  $\pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ .

*Part c)* Parts (a) and (b) show that  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  and  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$  are both empty or both non-empty. If both are empty, part (c) holds trivially.

Assume then that  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$  and  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  are both non-empty. Let

$$X := \sum_{Q \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})} Q \quad \text{and} \quad Y := \sum_{A \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})} A.$$

Suppose  $X < I_{\mathcal{D}}$ . Then  $\pi_\ell(I_{\mathcal{D}} - X) \neq 0$ , and if  $A \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ ,  $A\pi_\ell(I_{\mathcal{D}} - X) = 0$  by part (a). So  $\pi_\ell(I_{\mathcal{D}} - X) < I_{\mathcal{Z}} - Y$ ; hence  $Y < I_{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

Conversely, suppose  $Y < I_{\mathcal{Z}}$ . Then  $0 \neq \text{bimod}(I_{\mathcal{Z}} - Y)$ , so there exists  $0 \neq v \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) \cap \text{bimod}(I_{\mathcal{Z}} - Y)$ . Hence  $P_v \leq (I_{\mathcal{Z}} - Y)$ .

Suppose there is a  $Q \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  such that  $vQ \neq 0$ . Let  $w = vQ \in \mathcal{GN}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ . Clearly  $w \leq_{\mathcal{D}} v$ , and so by Lemma 3.6 we have  $P_w \leq P_v$ . Note that  $w^*w = Q$  is in  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  and hence  $ww^*$  is in  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ . By part (b) and Proposition 3.3 we have that  $\pi_\ell(ww^*)\pi_r(w^*w)$  is a non-zero projection in  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ . However, as  $P_w \leq \pi_\ell(ww^*)\pi_r(w^*w)$  and  $\pi_\ell(ww^*)\pi_r(w^*w)$  is atomic, it follows that  $P_w = \pi_\ell(ww^*)\pi_r(w^*w)$ . Hence we have

$$\pi_\ell(ww^*)\pi_r(w^*w) = P_w \leq P_v \leq (I_{\mathcal{Z}} - Y).$$

This is a contradiction. Hence  $vQ = 0$  for every  $Q \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$ . As  $v$  is non-zero it follows that  $X < I_{\mathcal{D}}$ .  $\square$

The following description of  $R_a$  is an immediate consequence of Propositions 3.3 and 3.7.

**Corollary 3.8.**

$$R_a = \{(Q_1, Q_2) \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D}) \times \text{atom}(\mathcal{D}) : Q_1 \mathcal{M} Q_2 \neq (0)\}.$$

## 4. MAIN RESULT

In this section, we prove our main result, Theorem 4.3. This result shows when the Cartan pair  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  has separable predual, the isomorphism class of the family of Bures-closed bimodules for  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  depends mostly upon the atomic part  $(\mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{D}_a)$  of  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ .

**Notation 4.1.** If  $S$  is any set,  $\text{card}(S)$  will denote the cardinality of  $S$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$  be a Cartan inclusion. Then  $\text{card}(R_a) = \text{card}(\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z}))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $q : \text{atom}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})/R_a$  be the quotient map. Define a map  $\phi : \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})/R_a$  as follows. For  $A \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$ , let  $Q_1, Q_2 \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})$  be the unique atoms of  $\mathcal{D}$  such that  $A = \pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2)$ , see Proposition 3.7. Now set  $\phi(A) = q(Q_1)$ .

Observe that  $\phi$  is onto: if  $x \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})/R_a$  and  $Q \in q^{-1}(x)$ , then  $A := \pi_\ell(Q)\pi_r(Q) \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$  (see Proposition 3.7) and  $\phi(A) = x$ .

Fixing  $x \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})/R_a$ , Proposition 3.7 implies that there is a bijection

$$\alpha_x : q^{-1}(x) \times q^{-1}(x) \rightarrow \phi^{-1}(x),$$

where  $\alpha_x$  is the map given by  $q^{-1}(x) \times q^{-1}(x) \ni (Q_1, Q_2) \mapsto \pi_\ell(Q_1)\pi_r(Q_2) \in \phi^{-1}(x)$ . Since  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$  and  $R_a$  are the disjoint unions,

$$\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z}) = \bigcup_{x \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})/R_a} \phi^{-1}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad R_a = \bigcup_{x \in \text{atom}(\mathcal{D})/R_a} (q^{-1}(x) \times q^{-1}(x)),$$

there exists a bijection

$$\alpha : R_a \rightarrow \text{atom}(\mathcal{Z})$$

given by  $\alpha(Q_1, Q_2) = \alpha_x(Q_1, Q_2)$  if  $(Q_1, Q_2) \in q^{-1}(x) \times q^{-1}(x)$ . □

For the following result we restrict our attention to the separably acting case.

**Theorem 4.3.** *For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $(\mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  be Cartan pairs where  $\mathcal{M}_i$  has separable predual, and let  $\mathfrak{S}_i$  be the lattice of all Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}_i$ -bimodules contained in  $\mathcal{M}_i$ . The following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) *There is a lattice isomorphism  $\alpha$  of  $\mathfrak{S}_1$  onto  $\mathfrak{S}_2$ .*
- (b) *There is a lattice isomorphism  $\alpha'$  from the projection lattice of  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  onto the projection lattice of  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ .*
- (c) *There is a von Neumann algebra isomorphism  $\Theta$  of  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  onto  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ .*
- (d) *The atomic relations  $R_{a,i}$  for  $(\mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  satisfy  $\text{card}(R_{a,1}) = \text{card}(R_{a,2})$ .*

*Proof.* The equivalence of (a) and (b) follows directly from [4, Theorem 2.5.8]. The equivalence of (b) and (c) is a piece of folklore about abelian von Neumann algebras. (Here is a sketch of the non-trivial direction. Suppose  $\alpha'$  is an isomorphism of the projection lattices. For every finite Boolean algebra,  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \text{proj}(\mathcal{Z}_1)$ ,  $\alpha'|_{\mathcal{A}}$  extends uniquely to a  $C^*$ -algebra isomorphism  $\Theta_{\mathcal{A}}$  of  $C^*(\mathcal{A})$  onto  $C^*(\alpha'(\mathcal{A}))$ . As  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  is the  $C^*$ -inductive limit of the family  $\{C^*(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A} \text{ a finite Boolean algebra of } \text{proj}(\mathcal{Z}_1)\}$  (with inclusion maps), the inductive limit  $\Theta$  of the maps  $\Theta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  onto  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ . But every isomorphism between von Neumann algebras is weak-\* continuous, so  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_2$  are isomorphic von Neumann algebras.)

If (c) holds, then  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z}_1)$  and  $\text{atom}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$  have the same cardinality, so Lemma 4.2 implies (d) holds. Conversely, if (d) holds, then the atomic parts of  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_2$  are



isomorphic. As  $\mathcal{Z}_i$  are MASAs acting on separable Hilbert spaces, Proposition 3.7(c) implies the continuous parts of  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_2$  are isomorphic. Therefore,  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  is unitarily equivalent to  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ , and (c) holds.  $\square$

Theorem 4.3 is perhaps initially most remarkable when we consider von Neumann algebras without atoms. For example, let  $(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$  be Cartan pairs where  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is of type  $\text{II}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is of type  $\text{III}_\lambda$  for some  $\lambda$ . Theorem 4.3 tells us that, while  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are quite different as von Neumann algebras, the lattice of Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}_1$ -bimodules of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is isomorphic to the lattice of Bures-closed  $\mathcal{D}_2$ -bimodules of  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . The following simple example illustrates the situation regarding the atoms in Theorem 4.3.

**Example 4.4.** For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $D_n \subseteq M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be the set of diagonal  $n \times n$  matrices. Let  $(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{D}_1) = (M_2(\mathbb{C}), D_2)$ , and let  $(\mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{D}_2) = (M_4(\mathbb{C}), D_4)$ . Then  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  is isomorphic to  $D_4$ , so these Cartan pairs have isomorphic lattices of bimodules.

**Remark 4.5.** The non-separable case is complicated by the fact that there are many isomorphism classes of non-atomic abelian von Neumann algebras. Indeed, if  $\mathcal{H}$  is non-separable and  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a non-atomic MASA with a unit cyclic vector  $\xi$ , then there is a countable set  $I$  such that  $\mathcal{D}$  is isomorphic to the direct sum,  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} L^\infty(X_i, \mu_i)$ , where  $X_i = [0, 1]^{A_i}$  is a Cartesian product of the unit interval,  $\mu_i$  is product measure, and for at least one  $i$ ,  $A_i$  is a set with  $\text{card}(A_i) > \aleph_0$  (see [9] and [11]). A general MASA decomposes into a direct sum of cyclic MASAs, hence there is a family  $\{Q_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{J}}$  of projections in  $\mathcal{D}$ , for which  $Q_\alpha \mathcal{D}$  is isomorphic to  $L^\infty([0, 1]^{A_\alpha})$ . Since  $Q_\alpha$  is not minimal, the arguments of Proposition 3.7 do not seem to apply, and it is not clear how the statement of Theorem 4.3 should be modified in the non-separable case.

## REFERENCES

- [1] AOI, H. A construction of equivalence subrelations for intermediate subalgebras. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* 55, 3 (2003), 713–725. MR 1978219 (2004c:46120), Zbl 1033.46046.
- [2] ARVESON, W. Operator algebras and invariant subspaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 100 (1974), 433–532. MR 0365167 (51 #1420), Zbl 0334.46070.
- [3] BURES, D. *Abelian subalgebras of von Neumann algebras*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1971. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 110. MR 0296706 (45 #5765), Zbl 0214.14103.
- [4] CAMERON, J.; PITTS, D. R.; ZARIKIAN, V. Bimodules over Cartan MASAs in von Neumann algebras, norming algebras, and Mercer’s theorem. arXiv:1202.6408 [math.OA], 2013.
- [5] FELDMAN, J.; MOORE, C. C. Ergodic equivalence relations, cohomology, and von Neumann algebras. I. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 234, 2 (1977), 289–324. MR 58 #28261a, Zbl 0369.22009.
- [6] FELDMAN, J.; MOORE, C. C. Ergodic equivalence relations, cohomology, and von Neumann algebras. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 234, 2 (1977), 325–359. MR 58 #28261b, Zbl 0369.22010.
- [7] FULMAN, I. Crossed products of von Neumann algebras by equivalence relations and their subalgebras. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 126, 602 (1997), x+107. MR 1371091 (98d:46073), Zbl 0879.46033.
- [8] HALMOS, P. R. *A Hilbert space problem book*, second ed., vol. 19 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 17. MR 675952 (84e:47001), Zbl 0496.47001.
- [9] MAHARAM, D. On homogeneous measure algebras. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 28 (1942), 108–111. MR 0006595 (4,12a), Zbl 0063.03723.
- [10] MUHLY, P. S.; SAITO, K.-S.; SOLEL, B. Coordinates for triangular operator algebras. *Ann. Math.* 127 (1988), 245–278. MR 0932297 (89h:46088), Zbl 0649.47036.
- [11] SEGAL, I. E. Equivalences of measure spaces. *Amer. J. Math.* 73 (1951), 275–313. MR 0041191 (12,809f), Zbl 0042.35502.

- [12] TAKESAKI, M. *Theory of operator algebras. II*, vol. 125 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, 6. MR 1943006 (2004g:46079), Zbl 1059.46031.

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, LINCOLN, NE, 68588-0130  
*E-mail address:* `afuller7@math.unl.edu`

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, LINCOLN, NE, 68588-0130  
*E-mail address:* `dpitts2@math.unl.edu`